UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,935	06/27/2003	Nicholas Grant Rasmussen	20567-023001	6976
20985 FISH & RICHA	7590 08/06/200 ARDSON, PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1022	,	GUILL, RUSSELL L		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2123	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/608,935	RASMUSSEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Russ Guill	2123	

	Russ Guill	2123					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); ducing or simplifying the ected claims.					
NOTE: Please refer to the Request for Reconsideration. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling.							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all-non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [         how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov         The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:         Claim(s) allowed:         Claim(s) objected to:         Claim(s) rejected:         Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:         AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> </ol>	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will	·	-				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  10. The affidavit or other evidence is an armond. A manufacturing the statement of the st	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> <li>M The request for reconsideration has been considered but</li> </ol>		•					
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (							
13.							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

First, the Examiner would like to thank the Applicant for the fully responsive and well prepared response.

While the claim amendments appear to overcome the prior art of record, an updated search is required to determine if further art applies to the claims. The Examiner remarks that claim 1 appears to have a minor typographical condition in line 11, which recites, "to form one or a symmetric". Further, especially since the response does not appear to recite support in the specification for the claim amendments, additional consideration is needed to ensure compliance under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Further, a valid process under 35 USC § 101 must either 1) transform underlying subject matter, or 2) be tied to another statutory class, such as a particular apparatus. In order to qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps. A mere nominal recitation of a computer in the first limitation of claim 1 does not appear sufficient to tie the process to a particular apparatus; not just any inclusion of a machine makes a method a statutory process. Please refer to the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, ex parte Langemyr, appeal 2008-1495. For at least these reasons, the application is not in condition for allowance...